



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/780,618

02/12/2001

Martin Sommer

SGW-109

9111

23599 7590 11/14/2008
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.
2200 CLARENDON BLVD.
SUITE 1400
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

CHEVALIER, ALICIA ANN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. Claims 30, 31, 33-51 and 53-70 are pending in the application, claims 1-29, 32 and 52 have been cancelled.
2. Amendments to the claims, filed on July 28, 2008, have been entered in the above-identified application.

REJECTIONS REPEATED

3. The 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of claims 30, 31, 33-51 and 53-70 over Christiansen (US Patent No. 5,490,965) is repeated for reasons previously made of record in the office action mailed March 28, 2008, pages 2-6, paragraph #5.

REJECTIONS

4. **The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 30, 31, 33-51 and 53-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the instant case amended claims 30, 31, 33-51 and 53-70 contain the

Art Unit: 1794

limitation “solid article” and “solid sealing element.” The only support in the specification for “solid” anything is on page 8, line 3, where it recites "welding by solid elements." Therefore, the limitations “solid article” and “solid sealing element” are considered to be new matter.

The new matter should be deleted.

6. Claims 30, 31, 33-51 and 53-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitations “solid article” and “solid sealing element” in claims 30, 31, 33-51 and 53-70 are unclear and render the claims vague and indefinite. It is unclear from the claims and the specification what constitutes "solid."

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS

7. Applicant's arguments in the response filed July 28, 2008 regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection over Christiansen of record have been carefully considered but are deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant argues that the rejection over Christiansen is maintained even though the description in the instant application and the references previously filed establish that the products are made by different methods would result in physically different products.

As stated in previous office actions, the method of making a product does not determine the patentability of the product, unless the process produces unexpected results. The method of forming the product is not germane to the issue of patentability of the product itself, unless Applicant presents evidence from which the Examiner could reasonably conclude that the

Art Unit: 1794

claimed product differs in kind from those of the prior art. MPEP 2113. Furthermore, Attorney argument is not evidence unless it is an admission, in which case, an examiner may use the admission in making a rejection. See MPEP 2129 and 2144.03 for a discussion of admissions as prior art. The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. See MPEP 716.01(c) for examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration. MPEP 2145. Applicant has not provided any evidence from which the Examiner could reasonably conclude that the claimed product differs in kind from those of the prior art, due to the method manufacture.

Applicant further argues that the reference filed on May 15, 2003, November 26, 2003 and May 10, 2004 establish that only the contact surfaces of the solid sealing element and the solid article are modified during the welding process in such a way, that the contact surface of the molded element and the contact surface of the solid sealing element are permanently bonded together in such a way that the opening is hermetically sealed.

Applicant's references are excerpts from the Principles of Welding and Pressure Welding Machines, which not an appropriate affidavit or declaration presenting evidence from which the Examiner could reasonably conclude that the claimed product differs in kind from those of the prior art. Furthermore, fact that only the contact surfaces of the solid sealing element and the solid article are modified during the welding process in such a way, that the contact surface of the molded element and the contact surface of the solid sealing element are permanently bonded together in such a way that the opening is hermetically sealed in not in the specification or claims. Applicant has not established that the products of the prior art and the claims are physically different.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Chevalier whose telephone number is (571) 272-1490. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 1794

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Alicia Chevalier/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

11/14/2008